

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 13, 2007. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 10 – 12, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 37, and 40 - 42 are amended, and claims 6, 20 and 27 are canceled; as a result, claims 1 – 5, 7 – 19, 21 – 26 and 28 - 42 are now pending in this application.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 13-17 and 33-36 were allowed.

Claims 5-12, 20, 21, and 26-32 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of claim 6, which has been stated to be allowable, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 8 – 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 7.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original base claim 1 and any intervening claim 4, and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 10, 11 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original base claim 1 and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations of claim 20, which has been stated to be allowable, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 20 has been cancelled. Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 18 and is believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of its dependency on claim 18. Claim 19 is also believed to be allowable because of its dependency on claim 18.

Claim 26 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original base claim 22 and intervening claim 25, and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 has been amended to include limitations of claim 27, which has been stated to be allowable, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 27 has been

cancelled. Claim 28 has been amended to depend from claim 22 and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 29-30 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 28. Claims 23 – 25 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 22.

Claims 31 and 32 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original base claim 22 and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 18, 19, 22-25, 37-39 and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giannakis et al. (U.S. 7,224,744) in view of Raleigh et al. (U.S. 6,452,981).

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of claim 6, which has been stated to be allowable, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2 – 4 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations of claim 20, which has been stated to be allowable, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 19 is also believed to be allowable because of its dependency on claim 18.

Claim 22 has been amended to include limitations of claim 27, which has been stated to be allowable, and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 23 – 25 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 22.

Claim 37 has been amended to recite limitations similar to claim 6 (now included in claim 1) and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 38 - 39 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 37.

Claim 40 has been amended to recite limitations corresponding to claim 27 (now included in claim 22) and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 41 – 42 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of their dependency on claim 40. Claims 40 – 42 have also been amended to recite a computer-readable medium that stores instructions, which is believed to be statutory subject matter.

**RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((480) 659-3314) to facilitate prosecution of this application.


If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

LEI SHAO

By his Representatives,  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(480) 659-3314

By /



Gregory J. Gorrie  
Reg. No. 36,530